

NAME OF PREPARER Robert C. Mulvey

PREPARER IS: ☐ USEPA EMPLOYEE

☒ STATE EMPLOYEE

DATE 08-20-85

1190400006-Madison Co.
Reilly Tar + Chem
RCRA Permit File

TREATMENT, STORAGE, DISPOSAL FACILITY
INITIAL SCREENING
FOR
ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE

FACILITY NAME Reilly Tar and Chemical Corporation

FACILITY ID # ILD 006 27B 360

FACILITY LOCATION 19th and Edwardsville Road

Granite City Madison ILLINOIS 62040
CITY COUNTY STATE ZIP CODE

EPA Region 5 Records Ctr.



393319

LIST ALL CURRENT INTERIM STATUS PROCESS CODES

S03, S01

LIST ALL PROCESS CODES PROPOSED IN PART B APPLICATION (IF APPLICABLE)

S03, S01

INSTRUCTIONS

FOR EACH OF ITEMS 1 THROUGH 11 BELOW, MARK ONE AND ONLY ONE BOX, BASED ON YOUR KNOWLEDGE OF THE FACILITY. USE THE "RATING DISCUSSION" TO ELABORATE, IF DESIRED. NOTE THAT ANY ENVIRONMENTAL CONCERN RATING OF HIGH CONSTITUTE YOUR RECOMMENDATION THAT THIS FACILITY IS "SUFFICIENTLY ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT" TO WARRANT PREPARATION OF A FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN. IN ORDER FOR YOU TO RECOMMEND THAT A FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN NEED NOT BE PREPARED, EACH AND EVERY ITEM MUST BE MARKED EITHER LOW OR N/A.

Environmental Concern
Rating

1. Rate concern relative to the CERCLA Program, and discuss -- (National Priority List sites should automatically be high concern; significant past handlers of CERCLA cleanup wastes should automatically be high concern; facilities that have absolutely no 'CERCLA connection' should be rated N/A)

HIGH

LOW

N/A

☐
☒
☐

RATING DISCUSSION: on ERRIS List not
rated 08/20/85. No Preliminary
Assessment 08/20/85

2. Rate concern relative to status as a commercial handler, and discuss -- (facilities that handle significant amounts of waste from a variety of sources should be rated high; facilities that handle only their own company's off-site waste could be rated low; facilities that only handle on-site generated wastes should be rated N/A)

☐
☐
☒

RATING DISCUSSION: on site generated
waste.

3. Rate concern relative to facility's financial condition (facilities which have or are expected to declare financial insolvency should be rated high)

☐
☒

RATING DISCUSSION: Principal activity
is making creosote and other
coal tar related products.

4. Rate concern relative to facility's 40 CFR Part 265 compliance status/history. (High priority violators and Significant Non-Compliers should be rated high; for proposed facilities, rating is N/A)

RATING DISCUSSION: _____

5. Based on the waste management processes employed (to be employed) at the facility, rate the concern, and discuss -- (processes subject to ground water monitoring will most often dictate a rating of high; incinerators will most often dictate a rating of high; "contained" storage/treatment such as in drums/tanks will most often rate low)

RATING DISCUSSION: Surface impoundments
which store sludge from
waste waters from creosote
processing (K035)

6. Based on the presence, absence, significance of old Solid Waste Management Units & whether releases from old or current units are known, suspected, corrected; rate the concern, and discuss -- (known & seriously suspected releases should dictate a rating of high, unless felt to be insignificant/de minimis)

RATING DISCUSSION: Releases from
the surface impoundments
(K035) documented.

Environmental Concern
Rating

HIGH

LOW

N/A

☐
☒
☐
☒
☐
☒
☐

Environmental Concern
Rating

HIGH

LOW

N/A

7. Rate concern, based only on the volume and type of waste handled, and discuss -- (low volumes of extremely toxic wastes could rate a high; very heavy volumes of waste could rate a high, though wastes are not particularly dangerous)

RATING DISCUSSION: No further discharges to impoundment. WWTP effluent discharges to city sewers.

☐
☒
☐
☒
☐

8. Rate concern relative to facility's NON-hazardous waste general environmental regulatory status/history, and discuss --

RATING DISCUSSION: Not well known.

☒
☐

9. Rate concern relative to facility's physical location (proximity to population or to sources of accidents or dangers which would tend to increase the facility's inherent danger)

RATING DISCUSSION: Extent of groundwater contamination plume to be determined.

Environmental Concern
Rating

10. Rate public concern, for whatever
reason

RATING DISCUSSION: _____

HIGH

☐

LOW

☒

N/A

11. Other

DISCUSS: _____

☐☐☐

BASED ON ABOVE ANALYSIS, RECOMMENDATION IS THAT

Reilly Tar and Chemical, Corporation

FACILITY NAME

IS ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT
AND A FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN
WILL BE PREPARED



IS NOT, AT THIS TIME, CONSIDERED
TO BE ENVIRONMENTALLY SIGNIFICANT,
AND A FACILITY MANAGEMENT PLAN
WILL NOT BE PREPARED



SUMMARY OF FACILITY SCREENING
FOR ENVIRONMENTAL SIGNIFICANCE

FACILITY NAME: Reilly Tar and Chemical Corporation
FACILITY ID # _____

Environmentally Significant

YES

NO

STATE'S RECOMMENDATION OF 08-20-85
DATE

☒☐

U.S. EPA RECOMMENDATION OF _____
DATE

☐☐

JOINT STATE - U.S. EPA DETERMINATION . . .

☐☐

Discussion of resolution of issues, if any, in
arriving at joint recommendation. Include
date(s), location, participants at any resolution
meetings.
